UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/565,031	01/17/2006	Gerald Josef Reinhard	16795-16	5378

52450 7590 08/06/2009

KRIEG DEVAULT LLP
ONE INDIANA SQUARE
SUITE 2800
INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204-2079

EXAMINER	
MORRISON, THOMAS A	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3653	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/06/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/565,031	REINHARD ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	THOMAS A. MORRISON	3653	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 April 2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-23,25-38 and 40-54* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) *54* is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-23,25-38 and 40-53* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

1. 1-23, 25-38, and 40-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. More specifically, section 2173.05(h) of the MPEP states

> I. MARKUSH GROUPS
> Alternative expressions are permitted if they present ***no uncertainty or ambiguity*** with respect to the question of scope or clarity of the claims. One acceptable form of alternative expression, which is commonly referred to as a Markush group, recites members as being "selected from the group consisting of A, B and C." See Ex parte Markush, 1925 C.D. 126 (Comm'r Pat. 1925). Ex parte Markush sanctions claiming a genus expressed as a group consisting of certain specified materials. Inventions in metallurgy, refractories, ceramics, pharmacy, pharmacology and biology are most frequently claimed under the Markush formula but purely mechanical features or process steps may also be claimed by using the Markush style of claiming. See Ex parte Head, 214 USPQ 551 (Bd. App. 1981); In re Gaubert, 524 F.2d 1222, 187 USPQ 664 (CCPA 1975); and In re Harnisch, 631 F.2d 716, 206 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1980). It is improper to use the term "comprising" instead of "consisting of." Ex parte Dotter, 12 USPQ 382 (Bd. App. 1931).

With regard to the Markush group set forth in claim 1 and its dependent claims, applicant improperly uses the recitation "wherein said sheet-processing modules are **selected from the following group of sheet processing modules**", because this recitation presents ambiguity with respect to the question of scope of the claims".

(emphasis added). As such claim 1 and its dependent claims are indefinite. See, e.g., MPEP 2173.05(h).

Regarding claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-39, it is unclear which modules are included in the recited sheet-processing machine. For example, claim 1 recites "wherein said sheet-processing modules are **selected from the following group of sheet processing modules**" ..." This recitation does not specify a limited number of modules that can be included or not included. Rather, the group of listed modules is open-ended and it is unclear what other possible modules may or may not be included in claim 1. It is unclear which modules are included or not included in the sheet-processing machine. Likewise, the dependent claims are unclear, because it is unclear which modules other than those claimed in the dependent claims are included from the list of modules set forth in independent claim 1. Further clarification is requested.

Regarding claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-39, it is unclear which machine assemblies are claimed. For example, claim 1 recites "the modules are provided in such a way that the following machine assemblies **can** be formed: ..." This recitation does not specify which of the listed machine assemblies are **actually included or not included**. Rather, all of the listed machine assemblies **can be formed** and none of the machine assemblies are required in claim 1. It is unclear which machine assemblies are included or not included. Likewise, the dependent claims are unclear, because it is unclear which machine assemblies are included in the dependent claims from the list of machine assemblies set forth in independent claim 1. Further clarification is requested.

Claim 12 depends from claim 11. Claim 11 recites "wherein a marking device for applying a marking to the sheets is arranged **in the numbering module**." (emphasis added). Claim 12 then recites "wherein the marking device is arranged **upstream of a numbering unit of the numbering module**". (emphasis added). Claim 12 appears to be inaccurate. How can the marking device be in the numbering module, as set forth in claim 11, and also upstream of the numbering module as set forth in claim 12? Further clarification is needed.

Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: (1) the structure of structural relationship between the recited elements in claim 40 that allows the marking device to apply the marking as unusable selectively to individual copies or in relation to individual copies on a sheet.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-32, 35, 37-39, 40 and 42-53, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Canadian Publication No. 2407810.

Regarding claim 1, Figs. 1-3 show sheet-processing machine for processing sheets each comprising a plurality of copies, the sheet-processing machine comprising a plurality of modules (including 1-21) through which the sheets are transported one after the other along a sheet conveying direction, the plurality of modules including a sheet feeder module (either 3 or 18) for feeding the sheets and one or more downstream sheet-processing modules (including 20),

wherein the sheet-processing modules are selected from the following group of sheet-processing modules:

an inspection module (including 7 and 11) for monitoring the print quality of the sheets;

a marking module (either 19 or 15) for marking a sheet as usable or unusable depending on a monitoring result of the inspection module; and

a numbering module (including 12, 13 and 14) for applying serial numbering to the sheets, and wherein the sheet feeder module (either 3 or 18) and the sheet-processing modules are designed in such a way that at least the following machine assemblies can be formed:

a first machine assembly comprising the sheet feeder module (18) and the numbering module (including 12, 13 and 14) directly connected in succession with respect to the sheet conveying direction;

a second machine assembly comprising the sheet feeder module (3), the inspection module (including 7 and 11) and the numbering module (including 12, 13 and 14) directly connected in succession with respect to the sheet conveying direction; and

a third machine assembly comprising the sheet feed module (3), the inspection module (including 7 and 11) and the marking module (15) directly connected in succession with respect to the sheet conveying direction.

Alternatively, it is noted that claim 1 recites "wherein the sheet feeder module and the sheet-processing modules are designed in such a way that at least the following machine assemblies **can be formed**: a first machine assembly ...a second machine assembly... and a third machine assembly... The word "can" does **not** positively claim the first, second or third machine assemblies. In view of the use of the word "can", it is the examiner's position that **none** of the first, second and third machine assemblies is required in claim 1.

Regarding claim 2, Figs. 1-3 show that transfer of a sheet from an upstream module (including 7 and 11) to a downstream module (including 12, 13 and 14) is effected by means of an output transport cylinder (11) located at a sheet output interface of the upstream module (including 7 and 11) which transfers the sheet to an input transport cylinder (12) located at a sheet input interface of the downstream module (including 12, 13 and 14).

Regarding claim 3, Figs. 1-3 show that the inspection module (including 7 and 11) comprises an even number of cylinders for transporting the sheets from a sheet input interface to a sheet output interface of the inspection module (including 7 and 11).

Regarding claim 4, Figs. 1-3 show that the output transport cylinder of the upstream module (including 7 and 11) and the input transport cylinder (12) of the downstream module have opposite directions of rotation.

Regarding claim 5, as best understood, Figs. 1-3 show that the sheet feeder module (3), inspection module (including 7 and 11), marking and numbering modules (19 and including 12, 13 and 14, respectively) each have their own respective side frame panels.

Regarding claim 6, Figs. 1-3 show that the sheet feeder module (3), inspection module (including 7 and 11), marking module (15 or 19) and numbering module (including 12, 13 and 14) have at least one transport cylinder which is fixed to the side frame panels. See also Page 13, lines 20-24.

Regarding claim 7, as best understood, Figs. 1-3 show that the side frame panels of the sheet feeder module (3), inspection module (including 7 and 11), marking module (15) and numbering module (including 12, 13 and 14) are fixed to one another.

Regarding claim 8, as best understood, Fig. 3 shows that the marking module and the numbering module have a cut-out for engagement and support of the side frame panels of the sheet feeder module or of the inspection module.

Regarding claim 9, Fig. 1 shows that columns (unnumbered foot portions) are provided for supporting the sheet feeder module and the inspection module.

Regarding claim 10, Figs. 1-3 show that, in the second machine assembly, the numbering module (including 12, 13 and 14) is arranged behind the inspection module (including 7 and 11) with respect to the sheet conveying direction, so as to apply the numbering only to those sheets which have passed the quality check carried out by the inspection module (including 7 and 11).

Regarding claim 11, Figs. 1-3 show that a marking device (including 12) for applying a marking to the sheets is arranged in the numbering module (including 12, 13 and 14).

Regarding claim 12, Figs. 1-3 show that the marking device (12) is arranged upstream of a numbering unit (including 12, 13 and 14) of the numbering module.

Regarding claim 13, Figs. 1-3 show that the marking device (12) is arranged on a counter-pressure cylinder of the numbering module (including 12, 13 and 14).

Regarding claim 14, page 9, lines 16-26 disclose that the marking device for applying a marking to the sheets marks an edge region of a column and/or row in which a fault detected by the inspection module is located.

Regarding claim 15, as best understood, page 9, lines 16-26 disclose that a marking device for applying a marking to the sheets marks a column and outputs a row number in which a fault detected by the inspection module is located.

Regarding claim 16, page 9, lines 16-26 disclose that the marking module comprises a marking device for applying a marking to sheets.

Regarding claim 17, as best understood, page 9, lines 16-26 disclose that the marking device is arranged to apply the marking as unusable selectively to individual copies or in relation to individual copies on a sheet.

Regarding claim 18, as best understood, Figs. 1-3 show that the marking device (including 12) comprises a plurality of print heads (13 and 14) which are distributed uniformly transversely to the sheet conveying direction.

Regarding claim 19, page 9, lines 4-8 disclose that the marking device (including 12) is an inkjet printing unit.

Regarding claim 20, Figs. 1-3 show that a transport module (including 4) is provided, which transport module (including 4) is interposed between the sheet feeder module (3) and the inspection module (including 7 and 11) to form an additional machine assembly.

Regarding claim 21, Figs. 1-3 show that an expansion module (including 10) is further provided, which expansion module (including 10) is interposed between the inspection module (including 7 and 11) and the marking module (including 12, 13 and 14) to form an additional machine assembly.

Regarding claim 22, Figs. 1-3 show that an inking unit module (including 15) is provided which, in conjunction with the marking module or the numbering module (including 12, 13 and 14), forms a printing module.

Regarding claim 23, Figs. 1-3 show that inking unit rollers of the inking unit module (including 15) are mounted in side frame panels which are connected to the side frame panels of the marking module or numbering module (including 12, 13 and 14).

Regarding claim 25, Figs. 1-3 show that a form cylinder is provided in the marking module (15) or numbering module (including 12, 13 and 14) for cooperation with the inking unit module (including 15) to form the printing module.

Regarding claim 26, Figs. 1-3 show that the inking unit module (15) forms the printing module in conjunction with the numbering module (including 12, 13 and 14) and wherein the printing module uses an output transport cylinder of the sheet feeder module or of the inspection module (including 7 and 11) upstream of the numbering module (including 12, 13 and 14) as counter-pressure cylinder for the form cylinder.

Regarding claim 27, Figs. 1-3 show that the inking unit module (15) is removably installed on the marking or numbering module (including 12, 13 and 14).

Regarding claim 28, Figs. 1-3 show that a circumference of the input and output transport cylinders (11) are of a same size.

Regarding claim 29, Figs. 1-3 show that the form cylinder is of a same size as the output transport cylinder acting as counter-pressure cylinder.

Regarding claim 30, Figs. 1-3 show that an output transport cylinder at the sheet output interface of the inspection module (including 7 and 11) and an output transport cylinder at the sheet output interface of the sheet feeder module (3) are arranged at a same height.

Regarding claim 31, Figs. 1-3 show that the inspection module (including 7 and 11) comprises two transport cylinders (4 and 10) for transporting the sheets for inspection of front and rear sides of the sheets by inspection devices (7 and 7').

Regarding claim 32, Figs. 1-3 show that the inspection devices comprise an image sensor (7 or 7') and a light source (8 or 8') for inspection by reflection.

Regarding claim 35, Figs. 1-3 show that the inspection module comprises a third transport cylinder (11) and an additional inspection device (17) for inspecting light-transmitting capacity of the sheets. Regarding the recitation "for inspecting the light-transmitting capacity of the sheets", this is a statement of intended use that does not distinguish claim 35 from the prior art apparatus of Canadian Publication No. 2407810.

Regarding claim 37, Figs. 1-3 show that the numbering module (including 12, 13 and 14) comprises at least one numbering unit (12) for printing a serial number on the sheets to be processed.

Regarding claim 38, Figs. 1-3 show that the numbering module (including 12, 13 and 14) comprises two numbering units (13 and 14) which are arranged on a counter-pressure cylinder (12) with two printing segments.

Regarding claim 40, as best understood, the marking device (page 9, lines 16-26) is arranged to apply the marking as unusable selectively to individual copies or in relation to individual copies on a sheet.

Regarding claim 42, the marking device (page 9, lines 16-26) is an inkjet printing unit.

Regarding claim 43, a configuration of a sheet input interface of the numbering module (including 12, 13 and 14) is identical to a configuration of a sheet input interface of the marking module (15) so that any one of the numbering module and marking module can be coupled directly to a sheet output interface of the inspection module (including 7 and 11).

Regarding claim 44, an inking unit module is provided which, in conjunction with the transport module (including 4), forms a printing module.

Regarding claim 45, inking unit rollers of the inking unit module are mounted in side frame panels which are connected to side frame panels of the transport module (including 4).

Regarding claim 46, a form cylinder is provided in the transport module (including 4) for cooperation with the inking unit module to form the printing module.

Regarding claim 47, the printing module uses an output transport cylinder of the sheet feeder module (3) upstream of the transport module (including 4) as counter-pressure cylinder for the form cylinder.

Regarding claim 48, the inking unit module is removably installed on the transport module (including 4).

Regarding claim 49, the form cylinder is of a same size as the output transport cylinder acting as counter-pressure cylinder.

Regarding claim 50, Fig. 1 shows columns (unnumbered foot portions) are provided for supporting the sheet feeder module, the transport module and the inspection module.

Regarding claim 51, Fig. 1 shows that columns (unnumbered foot portions) are provided for supporting the sheet feeder module, the inspection module and the expansion module.

Regarding claim 52, Figs. 1-3 show that the inking unit module forms the printing module in conjunction with the marking module and wherein the printing module uses an output transport cylinder of the inspection module upstream of the marking module as counter-pressure cylinder for the form cylinder.

Regarding claim 53, Figs. 1-3 show that the form cylinder is of a same size as the output transport cylinder acting as counter-pressure cylinder.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canadian Publication No. 2407810 as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,166,366 (Lewis et al.). Canadian Publication No. 2407810 discloses inspection devices (including 7 and 7') in transport cylinders (4 and 10) that include light sources (8 or 8') and light sensors (7 or 7'), but Canadian Publication No. 2407810 does not explicitly disclose that such light sources and light sensors include a UV light source and a light sensor, as claimed

Lewis et al. discloses that it is well known to provide a printing apparatus with a UV light source and light sensor that detects such light source, for the purpose of detecting defects in printed materials conveyed in the printer apparatus. See, e.g., col. 14, line 55 - col. 15, line 10, abstract, and Figs. 1-18. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the transport cylinders of the apparatus of Canadian Publication No. 2407810 with UV light sources and a UV light sensors for the purpose of detecting defects in materials conveyed on the printing apparatus of Canadian Publication No. 2407810, as taught by Lewis et al. Thus, all of the limitations of claim 33 are met by this combination of references.

4. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canadian Publication No. 2407810 as applied to claim 31 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,299,325 (Quinton et al.). Canadian Publication No. 2407810 discloses that it is well known to use inspection devices (including 7 and 7') for detecting defects in printed materials, but Canadian Publication No. 2407810 does not explicitly disclose that such inspection devices include a magnetic field sensor, as claimed

Quinton et al. discloses that it is well known to provide a sheet handling apparatus with a magnetic field sensor for the purpose of detecting defects in printed materials. See, e.g., Fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 31-36 of Quinton et al. Because Canadian Publication No. 2407810 and Quinton et al. both teach sensors for detecting defects in printed materials, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to substitute the detecting device (2) of Quinton et al. for the detecting devices (including 7 and 7') of Canadian Publication No. 2407810 to achieve the predictable result of detecting defects in printed materials. Thus, all of the limitations of claim 34 are met.

5. Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canadian Publication No. 2407810.

Regarding claim 41, page 9, lines 16-26 of Canadian Publication No. 2407810. explain that the marking device can print special marks for unacceptable bills that include a series of lines. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the marking device of the apparatus of Canadian Publication No. 2407810 with a plurality of print heads which are distributed uniformly transversely to the sheet conveying direction, for the purpose of

simultaneously printing the series of lines in the special mark across the width of each unacceptable bill to indicate that such bill is unacceptable, rather than having to print individual lines and make multiple passes of the unacceptable bill over a single print head. See, e.g, page 9, lines 16-26 of Canadian Publication No. 2407810. Thus, all of the limitations of claim 41 are rendered obvious by Canadian Publication No. 2407810.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 12/31/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue

> This being said, Canadian Publication No. 2 407 810 does not disclose that the sheet feeder (1, 2, 3), the inspection unit (4-10) and the numbering unit (11-14) are designed as modules, nor that any of the other two machine assemblies defined in claim 1 can be formed. As a matter of fact, Canadian Publication No. 2 407 810 is silent about any marking module, as claimed, that can be combined with other modules to form the third machine assembly defined in claim 1. There is furthermore no indication or suggestion in Canadian Publication No. 2 407 810 regarding the first machine assembly defined in claim 1.

The examiner disagrees. With regard to applicants' argument about Canadian Publication No. 2 407 810 not disclosing modules, the dictionary provides a very broad definition for the term "module". Namely, the dictionary defines the term "module" as "**a separable component**, frequently one that is interchangeable with others, for assembly into units of different size, complexity, or function". See, e.g., Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language (2001), at page 1237. Keeping this broad definition in mind, it is the examiner's position that the sheet feeder (3 or 18), the inspection unit (including 7 and 11) and the numbering unit (including 12, 13 and 14) are

separable components, e.g., by disassembling such components from one another or breaking such components from one another. In either case, these units can be considered modules according to the broad dictionary definition above.

With regard to applicants' remark about the third machine assembly in claim 1, it is noted that claim 1 recites "wherein the sheet feeder module and the sheet-processing modules are designed in such a way that at least the following machine assemblies **can be formed**: a first machine assembly ...a second machine assembly... and a third machine assembly... The word "can" does **not** positively claim the first, second or third machine assemblies. In view of the use of the word "can", it is the examiner's position that **none** of the first, second and third machine assemblies is required in claim 1.

In any event, Figs. 1-3 of Canadian Publication No. 2 407 810 show a first machine assembly comprising the sheet feeder module (18) and the numbering module (including 12, 13 and 14) directly connected in succession with respect to the sheet conveying direction. Also, Figs. 1-3 of Canadian Publication No. 2 407 810 show a third machine assembly comprising the sheet feed module (3), the inspection module (including 7 and 11) and the marking module (15) directly connected in succession with respect to the sheet conveying direction. Thus, all of the limitations of claim 1 are met by Canadian Publication No. 2 407 810. See the detailed rejection of claim 1 outlined above.

Next, applicants argue

Lewis et al. (US Patent No. 6~166,366)
Lewis et al. is only cited in connection with the subject-matter of dependent claim 33 regarding the provision of inspection devices

comprising a UV light source and a light sensor for detecting fluorescence produced by the UV light source.
The Examiner's assessment of Lewis et al. is correct insofar as reference is made in Lewis et al. to the provision of inspection devices for inspecting printed images, which inspection devices may comprise a UV light source and a light sensor for detecting fluorescence produced by the UV light source (see column 14, line 55, to column 15, line 10).
Lewis et al. is therefore not relevant for any of the other claimed subject-matter. More particularly, Lewis et al. does not affect the patentability of independent claims 1 and 54.

All of the limitations of claim 1 are met by Canadian Publication No. 2 407 810.

Then, Lewis et al. is relied upon in combination with Canadian Publication No. 2 407 810 to render claim 33 obvious.

Then, applicants argue

Quintou et al. (us Patent No. 4~299~325)
Quinton et al. is only cited in connection with the subject-matter of dependent claim 34 regarding the provision of inspection devices comprising a magnetic field sensor.
The Examiner's assessment of Quinton et al. is correct insofar as reference is made in Quinton et al. to the provision of a magnetic field sensor for identifying magnetic stickers applied on rejected documents (see column 2, lines 31-36).
Quinton et al. is therefore not relevant for any of the other claimed subject-matter. More particularly, Quinton et al. does not affect the patentability of independent claims 1 and 54.

All of the limitations of claim 1 are met by Canadian Publication No. 2 407 810.

Then, Quinton et al. is relied upon in combination with Canadian Publication No. 2 407 810 to render claim 34 obvious.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claim 54 is allowed. Claim 36 appears to include allowable subject matter, but it is not known how applicant will address the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, outlined above.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THOMAS A. MORRISON whose telephone number is (571)272-7221. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Mackey can be reached on (571) 272-6916. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Patrick H. Mackey/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3653

8/2/09